

pair in the Museum of the Royal Society and now in the British, to which the ticket of Mexican was attached. With this information he inferred it to belong to Hernandez's *Teutla Macame* . . ." (Griff. Cuv., IV, 130, 1827). That this was really the case there can be no doubt, for Hernandez's description is evidently composite, and is accompanied by a figure of an anomalous goat-like deer-antelope not referable to any known species, while Pennant's description applies in every particular to a deer and in nowise to an antelope, and is accompanied by a good figure of antlers which are at least those of a deer, and if abnormal, of the same sort of abnormality that frequently occurs in several forms of American deer. Antlers of this kind have been repeatedly figured (See Baird, Mamm. N. Am. p. 652, 1857; Baillie-Grohman, Sport & Life in W. Am. & B. C., p. 136, 1900; Recreation, XII, 348, 1900), and Mr. E. W. Nelson informs me that he has seen similar ones in Mexico. The horns figured by Pennant are perhaps still in the British Museum as Gray mentioned them as late as 1872 (Cat. Rum. Mamm. B. M. p. 83, 1872). That they were really horns of some form of American whitetail deer is shown by the characteristic subbasal snags and forward curving beams, in essential agreement with the horns figured by Baird (loc. cit.). Moreover, J. E. Gray, and others who have made reference to them, have unhesitatingly referred them to one or another of the whitetail group. The exact locality from which these horns came may be indeterminate, but even if this be so, the restriction of the name *mexicanus* by Lichtenstein (Darst. pl. XVIII and text, 1827-34) and the usage of subsequent authors gives abundant authority for its application to the deer of the Valley of Mexico. Surely a well known, current name, based, at least in part, upon an identifiable specimen, should not be displaced unless there is to be a general rejection of all names not based upon absolutely flawless descriptions and figures.—*Wilfred H. Osgood.*

### The type locality of *Ametrida minor* H. Allen.

In the Proceedings of the Boston Society of Natural History (Vol. 26, p. 240-246, May, 1894), under the title, "On a New Species of *Ametrida*," Dr. Harrison Allen described a new bat, giving it the name *Ametrida minor*. He states, on page 241, "Locality unknown. Type, a male, mature individual in alcohol. . . Museum of the Boston Society of Natural History". This type specimen is still carefully preserved at the Society's museum, and at the time of its description was without label of name or locality. Thinking that it might be possible to obtain some clue as to the history of the specimen, I recently examined it, but, at first, found no data with it whatsoever, beyond a recent label giving its name and place of description. While putting the specimen away, however, a small bit of paper, rendered almost transparent through long immersion in the alcohol, was discovered in the bottom of the bottle, and on examination, it was found to bear on one side the number

781, written with lead pencil. A search was at once made among several old catalogues of the Society's collections, with the result that in "A new Catalogue of the Specimens in the Department of Comparative Anatomy belonging to the Boston Society of Natural History," 1859-1875, there was found the entry of this specimen, as "Phyllostoma," one example, from Surinam, received in 1832 from Dr. Cragin". From this it would appear that the type locality of *Ametrida minor* is Surinam, or Dutch Guiana, South America. The date of acquisition, as above given, is probably erroneous. This catalogue, it appears, was copied from an earlier manuscript catalogue and the date 1832 may have been substituted through mistake, for 1839, when Dr. Francis W. Cragin, in March of that year, presented to the Society "a large and valuable collection of Mammalia, Birds, Reptiles, Fishes, Insects and Shells from Surinam". The previously recorded donations of Dr. Cragin, as entered in an early catalogue of the '30's, did not include any mammals. The exact locality in Surinam whence the bat came, cannot now be determined; but, as I am informed by Dr. Cragin's son, Prof. F. W. Cragin, the donor of the specimen resided for a number of years at Paramaribo, where he was for a time U. S. consul, so that it is quite probable that it came from that vicinity. The coloration of the type specimen, as recorded by its describer, is "almost white", which may in part be due to bleaching in alcohol for these sixty odd years, though otherwise it is still in an excellent state of preservation. Trouessart appears to have omitted the species altogether from his recent "Catalogus".—*Glover M. Allen.*

#### An early name for the northern form of *Sphyrapicus ruber*.

About a year ago Mr. Joseph Grinnell (Condor, III, 12, 1901) described a new sapsucker from southern California as *Sphyrapicus varius daggetti*, restricting Gmelin's *Picus ruber* to the northwest coast region. Mr. W. H. Osgood has recently (N. A. Fauna, No. 21, 45, September 26, 1901) reversed the case by considering the northern form to be the new one, reviving for it *Picus flaviventris* Vieillot (Ois. Amer. Sept., II, 1807, 67), based on Cook's description (Last Voyage, II, 1784, 297). If Mr. Osgood's view of the question should prove to be the correct one, a still earlier term, *Picus ruber notkensis* Suckow (Anfangsgr. Naturgesch. Thiere, II, I, 1800, 535) will have to be considered. Suckow also based his name on Cook, and gave practically the same description as did Vieillot. He indicated the relationship of Cook's bird by making it a subspecies of *Picus ruber*, and was one of the first naturalists to consistently and intelligently use trinomials as we do at present. The proper name for the northern form would therefore appear to be *Sphyrapicus ruber notkensis* (Suckow).—*Charles W. Richmond.*